

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 9-26 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 have been amended, claims 5 and 8 have been canceled, and new claims 9-26 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. In addition, the specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

### **I. The Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)**

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, and 7 were rejected for being anticipated by the Copp patent. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that “inclination surfaces are formed as triangular planes by chamfering four edges of the shroud in order to smoothly flow air introduced in the radius direction.” (See, for example, Paragraph [42] of the specification and Figure 5 of the application drawings for support). The Copp patent does not disclose these features, i.e., Copp discloses a shroud 64 which have inclined surfaces. However, those inclined surfaces do not include the triangular planes recited in claim 1 or any of the features relating to those triangular planes. Because the Copp patent does not disclose all the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Copp does not anticipate claim 1 or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite similar features. Applicants therefore submit that claim 6 and its dependent claims are also allowable over Copp.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 were rejected for being anticipated by the Bushnell patent. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

The Bushnell patent discloses a shroud 35 located in an air conditioner. However, as shown in Figure 12, the Bushnell shroud does not have the triangular planes recited in claims 1 and 6. Consequently, the Bushnell shroud will create different air flow paths compared to the triangular planes of the claimed invention. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6, and their dependent claims are allowable over Bushnell.

## **II. The Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 5 and 8 were rejected for being obvious in view of Copp or Bushnell taken in combination with the Thomaschewski publication. Some of the features in these claims have been incorporated into claims 1 and 6. The Thomaschewski publication does not teach or suggest the features added by amendment to claims 1 and 6.

The Thomaschewski publication discloses triangular sections that are formed around a fan. However, those triangular sections are not inclined as required by claim 1, i.e., Thomaschewski does not teach or suggest inclination surfaces formed as triangular planes by chamfering four edges of the shroud in order to smoothly flow air introduced in the radius direction. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6 are allowable over any combination formed among the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references.

### **III. New Claims**

New claims 9-20 have been added to the application.

Claim 9 recites that the four edges (which include the included triangular surfaces) in claim 1 correspond to respective corners of the shroud. (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 10 recites that “the shroud further includes four additional surfaces interposed between respective ones of the triangular planes, each of the four additional surfaces having four sides.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 11 recites that “the triangular planes and the four additional surfaces form eight corresponding flow paths, and wherein the flow paths corresponding to the triangular planes curve along flow lines that have substantially no right angles.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 12 recites that “each of the additional surfaces has a trapezoidal shape.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 13 recites that “the triangular planes are different from right-angle triangular planes.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 14 recites that “the front surface has an octagonal shape defined by positions of the triangular planes.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 15 recites that “each of the triangular planes has three points” and that “a first point extends towards the lateral surface of the shroud and second and third points extend toward the front surface of the shroud.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 16 recites that “the first point contacts the lateral surface of the shroud and the second and third points contact the front surface of the shroud.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 17 recites that “the triangular planes are inclined at acute angles relative to lateral surfaces of the shroud.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features

are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 18 recites that “the triangular planes are inclined at substantially a same acute angle relative to lateral surfaces of the shroud.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 19 recites that “the triangular planes lie in planes different from a front surface or the lateral surfaces of the shroud.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 20 recites that “the triangular planes are arranged diagonally relative to the front and lateral surfaces of the shroud.” (See, for example, Figure 5 of the application drawing). These features are not taught or suggested by the Copp, Bushnell, and Thomaschewski references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claims 21-26 recite similar features depending from claim 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,


Serial No. 10/576,576

Docket No. P-0771

Reply to Office Action of Oct. 1, 2008

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y. J. Kim

Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777

**Date:** December 31, 2008

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**